

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-44 have been canceled. New claims 45-54 are presented for review. No new matter has been entered with these newly presented claims.

Claims 20-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over FCI's Jumbo PV receptacle in view of Miwa (U.S. Pat. No. 5,788,542). The rejection of record is moot because claims 20-42 have been canceled.

New claims 45-53 each recite a terminal including, *inter alia*, a contact section comprising a first tubular portion having a first set of sidewalls, a second tubular portion having a second set of sidewalls and arranged end to end with the first tubular portion. Furthermore, in independent claim 45 the second set of sidewalls are longer than the first set of sidewalls. In independent claim 48, central axes of the first and second tubular portions are misaligned. And in independent claim 52, the first tubular portion has an effective diameter that is a different size than that of the second tubular portion. These terminal features are neither taught nor suggested by Miwa or FCI's Jumbo PV receptacle taken alone or in combination. For example, the drawings offered by the examiner to show a combination of Miwa and FCI's prior art receptacle (allegedly derived by one of ordinary skill in the art) do not read on new claims 45-53.

New claim 54 recites a female electrical terminal comprising a contact section and a flexible contact element partially disposed in the contact section, wherein the female electrical terminal is devoid of any structure prohibiting access to a leading edge of the flexible contact. These terminal features are neither taught nor suggested by Miwa or FCI's Jumbo PV receptacle taken alone or in combination. To the extent the examiner authored drawings read on new claim 54, Applicant submits that the examiner's drawings do not accurately represent how one of ordinary skill in the art would likely modify FCI's prior receptacle in view of the teachings of Miwa. Thus, the examiner authored drawings do not serve as a proper basis for rejection. Miwa discloses the use of a protecting wall to *block the front of bent portion 39*, such that "even if external force is applied to the electrical contact portion during the transportation thereof and so forth before it is mounted in a housing, the female terminal is not deformed since the resilient contact piece is protected by the protecting wall portion." (Col. 2, lns. 4-8). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would likely add a

**DOCKET NO.:** FCI-2632/C3069  
**Application No.:** 09/989,271  
**Office Action Dated:** January 14, 2004


**PATENT**  
**REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED**  
**PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO**  
**37 CFR § 1.116**

protecting wall directly in front of the leading edge of the flexible element of FCI's Jumbo PV receptacle to prohibit access to the same. Accordingly, new claim 54 is patentably distinct from a properly construed modification of FCI's prior art receptacle in view of the teachings of Miwa.

Applicant submitted a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (SIDS) on January 5, 2004. Applicant requests the examiner to consider the references included with the SIDS, and acknowledge the same by initialing the PTO Form 1449.

Early and favorable considerations are earnestly solicited.

Date: March 1, 2004



Andrew J. Hagerty  
Registration No. 44,141

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439